

weight baby and the critical care that must be delivered in the intensive care and the neonatal intensive care units of our hospitals around this country.

Yet we see that those are the ones that the Gingrich Republicans have focused in on like a laser. They went immediately to those programs to cut that out. Out of the child nutrition programs and the WIC programs, we see over \$7 billion over the next 5 years being taken out of those programs. This year we see \$25 million directly taken out of the Women, Infants, and Children Program. Surely—surely the voters of America, the Republicans of America, do not believe that the first efforts in trying to balance the budget should be on the backs of these poor children, of these women at risk in their pregnancies, and of these newborn infants that are struggling, struggling to hold on to life, because we were not able to give them the attention during the pregnancy that we should have.

□ 0950

Surely that is not what this is all about. Nor should it be allowed to stand. People should call their Members of Congress and tell them that they want this 20-year program of success maintained. We are talking about \$1.50 a day during the term of that pregnancy. That should not be on the chopping block out of humanity and out of caring for these children and for these pregnant women.

"THE PROJECT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great concern about an article which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. Since I read articles in most newspapers with great skepticism, I hope that facts set out in this article are not true.

According to the article in the Washington Post, a prominent Democratic Congressman at a recent Washington dinner party enthusiastically discussed what he referred to as "The Project"—a coordinated, calculated effort designed to politically destroy Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

A week later, another Member of the Democratic Party, in a keynote address to a party convention in Boca Raton, disclosed that the House Democratic leadership had embarked on a day-by-day plan to investigate the House Speaker, harass the Speaker, and drive him from office.

According to the article, members of the Democratic leadership in the House meet on a weekly basis for this purpose. Mr. GEPHARDT is represented at the meetings and the White House is also kept informed.

The Democratic National Committee also publishes a weekly "Newt Gram" trashing the Speaker.

Two senior liberal Democratic Members of Congress—not a part of "The Project"; that is, Newt bashing—said "Our party attacks GINGRICH because we don't have anything else to say."

If it is true, what a tragedy—the National Democratic Party and its leaders deliberately working on "The Project" to destroy another political leader.

Our great Nation faces many serious issues crying out for a solution. It is almost incomprehensible that a handful of Democratic leaders would be consumed with such a destructive compulsion for revenge.

It is not surprising that in so many issues we have debated on this floor during the last month that a handful of Democrats have used similar tactics to polarize America. Pitting the poor versus the middle class—and the middle class versus wealthy members of our society—in effect using scare tactics.

We are all Americans and we must develop solutions that will benefit our entire society not just one part of our society. The American people not only deserve but demand that Members of Congress devote their time and energy trying to solve very serious national issues instead of trying to destroy another political leader because they do not agree with his political philosophy.

The election box is the proper place to decide philosophical differences, not some sinister plan referred to as "The Project."

EFFECTS OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ON WOMEN AND CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but let us talk issues instead of speak personality.

When the Republicans talked about the contract for America, they did not tell anyone it would be women and children first. The first round of cuts were in the school breakfast and lunch programs. The second round of cuts include funding for safe and drug-free schools and the summer jobs program.

The Speaker may not believe liberals and even call some of us liars. This report that I will insert in the RECORD from the Houston Post talked about the "foes are lying about children." He says they are lying this last weekend.

Well, I am a Member from Texas. I am not lying about what my Texas State agency and my school district told me about the school lunch and breakfast program.

We would sustain a cut of almost 4 percent for our lunch and breakfast programs. I would hope we could tone down the rhetoric and talk about issues. I share the concern of my colleague who just spoke.

Again, we could see a definite cut of 4 percent in our Texas program and a half-million dollars in the Houston independent school district, the largest school district in the State of Texas.

The school breakfast and lunch programs, as estimated by the Texas Education Agency, will lose for the children of Texas \$261 million in 1996. On the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, we tried to strike the nutrition programs from the Republican reform bill, but we were outvoted on a party line vote by the Republican majority. I will go to that in a few minutes. Let us look at what this new amended contract for America talks about, not only cutting children nutrition programs and the WIC Program. Let us see now; we are having \$11 million for two new executive airplanes for the Army that they did not request, \$20 million more for a new runway for a base that is on the base closure commission list, a million dollars for a bike trail in North Miami Beach.

One thing that is apparent in this new amended Contract With America, there is no clause that our children will have a hot nutritious meal or a clause that our children will have a safe and drug-free school or that our children may have a summer youth job program.

Let me continue with the children's nutrition. A TV consumer reporter in Houston just last night said that it took the Republican majority 40 years to gain control of the House but only took them 40 days to cut food to children. The school-based nutrition grant program overall funding would be \$104 million less in fiscal year 1996; \$101.3 billion would be transferred out of the block grant in 1996 for nonfood programs, which would compromise the health of children.

The school-based nutrition block grant would eliminate the standards that guarantee America's children access to healthy meals.

There was an amendment adopted in the committee last week that said for the first year the States can all come up with 50 nutritional grant programs, but at the end of that year there would be some national standards. Well, we already have some national standards that apply whether you are in Texas or New York or California. We are building in additional costs into this program by having 50 States to develop their nutrition plans and then have to comply with some national standards.

The new school-based nutrition block grant would not respond to recessions or recoveries. If this bill had been enacted in 1989, it would have resulted in the 70-percent reduction in funding for school meals in 1994 alone. Between 1990 and 1994, the number of free lunches served to low-income children